DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 306 SP 010 343

AUTHOR Van Fleet, Alanson A.; And Others
TITLE Implementing Teacher Education Centers: The Florida Experience.
INSTITUTION Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Gainesville.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 91p.
AVAILABLE FROM Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Inc., 126 Building E, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611 ($2.00)
JOURNAL CIT Research Bulletin; v10 n3 Spr 1976

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Organizational Communication; *Organizational Development; *Organizational Effectiveness; Power Structure; Resource Centers; Surveys; *Teacher Centers; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS Florida

ABSTRACT

This monograph is an historical document portraying the problems of starting Florida's first ten teacher education centers (1974-75). Its aim is to provide information to individuals and groups considering active participation in teacher education centers. The document is organized as four sections followed by a bibliography and appendix. The first section, "Teacher Education Centers in Florida: An Overview," discusses the basic concepts of teacher centers and the internal organization of centers. The second section, "Start Up Problems of Teacher Education Centers in Florida," catalogs the problems common to Florida Teacher Centers: deadlines and directives, organizational strain, reward systems, needs assessment, grass roots support, incentives and distractions, and external events. Section three of the document, "Inside Calico Teacher Education Center," is a diary of a hypothetical center council. Section four, "Generalizations from the Florida Experience," summarizes observations about the program. An appendix contains an instrument designed to survey the inservice needs of teachers. (DMT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

ED127306

RESEARCH BULLETIN

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Implementing Teacher Education Centers:

The Florida Experience

SP010 343

Volume 10 Spring, 1976 Number 3

IMPLEMENTING TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS: THE FLORIDA EXPERIENCE

by

Alanson A. Van Fleet
Research Associate

and

Suzanne M. Kinzer
Associate Professor

College of Education
University of Florida

and

J. P. Lutz
Associate for Teacher Education
Florida Department of Education

Published by

The Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Inc.

Spring, 1976

Published Quarterly

Annual Subscription $6.00
Individual Copies 2.00

10% discount on an order of 5 or more. Orders for 4 or fewer must be pre-paid. Otherwise, an additional charge for postage and handling will be included in the invoice.

This is the official publication of the Florida Educational Research and Development Council, Inc. - 126 Building E, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, 32611.

Tear Here

INDIVIDUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

are available to

Florida Educational Research and Development Council Bulletins

Four (4) 1975-76 Research Bulletins on
Current Topics in Education

A Bonus Bulletin is available
with your New Subscription.
You may select one Bulletin from the list
at the back of this Bulletin without additional cost.

Please fill in this page and send to:

FERDC
126 Building E
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

The Bonus Bulletin I would like to receive is: _____

_____

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Enclosed is my check/money order to FERDC in the amount of
$6.00 to cover the cost of my subscription, mailing, and handling.

Tear Here

FOREWORD

This FERDC Bulletin is designed to assist those people who are, or will be, responsible for planning and implementing a Teacher Education Center.

We are fortunate to have authors who have seen the implementation of Florida Teacher Education Centers from various points of view: as an "insider" helping develop the plans and implementing a Center; as a person at the state level attempting to interpret the legislation and assist Center people in their planning and implementation; and as an observer/evaluator working with various Centers.

FERDC congratulates the authors on their presentation of concrete problems, reactions of participants, and projections of where Centers appear to be heading.

W. F. Breivogel, Ed. D.
Executive Secretary

Spring, 1976

PREFACE

For those in Florida thinking about starting teacher education centers (established by law in 1973), there is a special need to know problems these centers faced in their first year of operation. As teacher centers grow in popularity in our country, hundreds of school districts, teacher organizations, colleges of education, and unaffiliated groups of teachers are deciding whether or not to start a teacher center. Whether by law or by choice, school personnel should be aware of the problems attendant to starting a teacher center. This monograph is directed toward portraying potential start-up problems so that planners may understand and even plan for their solution. Our aim has been to provide potentially helpful information to individuals and groups who are considering becoming active in teacher education centers, especially in Florida. A legitimate scholarly concern also exists about factors that influence educational change. While we do not intentionally seek to address the problems of change, useful evidence may be found for students of those problems.

The reader should realize this is an historical document covering the problems of starting Florida's first ten teacher education centers (1974-75). Since then, four new centers have been started, changes have taken place locally and state-wide, and some of the problems reported here either have been solved or have disappeared, and newer ones have appeared.

This monograph is based on the authors' different experiences and perspectives. It is partially the result of field research sponsored by grants from the Florida Department of Education (750-177) and the United States Office of Education (OEG-0-74-2991). It reflects the involvement of one of the authors in a teacher education center council. A general perspective is added by another author who is in direct contact with each of Florida's centers.

Any undertaking of this sort owes deep-felt gratitude to those whose efforts we study and comment on. We only hope our thanks can be expressed in the usefulness of our work.

AAVF
SMK
JPL

January, 1976
Gainesville, Florida

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
SECTION I	Teacher Education Centers in Florida: An Overview	1
	Table I.: Florida's Teacher Education Centers (1974-75)	7
	Figure 1.: Florida's Teacher Education Centers (1974-75)	8
SECTION II	Start-Up Problems of Teacher Education Centers in Florida	15
SECTION III	Calico Teacher Center Council: A Case Study	39
SECTION IV	Generalizations from the Florida Experience	62
BIBLIOGRAPHY	----------	69
APPENDIX	----------	71

SECTION I

TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS IN FLORIDA: AN OVERVIEW

As the 1975-76 school year begins there are already over 4,500 teacher centers in America. Their rapid growth in the past few years has led educational commentators to say that the teacher center "movement" is the hottest item on today's educational scene. One reason for the rapid growth of teacher centers is the flexibility of the concept itself. Currently an almost bewildering variety of organizational forms, activities, and purposes are gathered under the label "teacher center."

Within this variety two general and fundamentally different types of teacher centers exist: single-agency and multi-agency. Single-agency centers have been formed by groups of teachers, school districts, teacher organizations and private concerns, in which teachers gather together on a voluntary basis to share ideas and materials for the dual purpose of fellowship and professional improvement. This type of center appears to be an American adaption of the British style of informal teacher center. Multi-agency teacher centers have been established by consortia of teacher training institutions, school districts, and often teacher organizations in an effort to deliver more cooperative and field-based teacher education.

This type of center rests on the cooperative delivery of teacher education services and can be more accurately thought of as a cooperative teacher education center rather than simply as a center for teachers. Multi-agency centers have grown more from reform efforts in teacher education than from concerns of local groups of educational practitioners. Teacher education centers in Florida are multi-agency centers.

The Teacher Education Center Act of 1973 (Florida Statutes 231.600-231.611), as amended in 1974, provided for the development of a statewide system of teacher education centers and sponsored a new form of institutional cooperation designed to give new shape and meaning to teacher education in Florida. The following passages from the Act illustrate the intent and scope of the legislation:

- The purposes of this act are to declare a new state policy for the education of teachers....

- The most important influence the school can contribute to the learning of any student is the attitudes, skills, knowledge, and understanding of the teacher.

- Teachers can best assist with improving education when they participate in identifying needed changes and in designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating solutions to meet the

identified needs.

- The education of teachers is inherently a career-long process. Effective July 1, 1973, the responsibility for operating programs for preservice and inservice teacher education is assigned jointly to the colleges and universities, to the district school boards, and to the teaching profession ...

- In order to facilitate collaboration between colleges and universities and school districts, ensure appropriate involvement and participation of teachers, and establish procedures for joint utilization of resources available for preservice and inservice teachers, the State Board of Education shall issue regulations for the establishment of teacher education centers in school districts.

The language of this Act gains life through the new responsibilities assumed by teachers, school district administrators and university personnel. Making teacher education a partnership is more easily accomplished in legal language than in actual practice. The new policy is necessary, although not sufficient, for bringing about needed change in the conduct of teacher education.

In brief, teacher education centers were established by the legislature to be a cooperative

venture among local school districts, colleges of education, community colleges, classroom teachers, and community representatives. These groups are supposed to collaboratively determine staff development needs of school district personnel, plan training activities, and deliver services that are responsible to identified needs, and subsequently to evaluate their programs. In Florida, teacher education centers are not buildings or specific places where teachers meet for training. In that sense, the term "center" is misleading. Neither are they solely for teachers, since all school district employees are eligible to receive their staff development training through the center; such employees include administrators, principals, secretaries, custodians, and bus drivers. Thus Florida's teacher centers are not strictly "teacher centers," but are coordinating agencies within local school district administrative units which plan, deliver and evaluate teacher education and staff development programs for participating school districts.

Fulfillment of the legislative intent requires new behaviors on the part of all groups in teacher education. Teachers have to assume more initiative and responsibility in their professional training, although this may seem unfamiliar to them. School district administrators have to abandon their traditional duty of "giving" inservice education to teachers whether it meets teacher needs or not. University personnel, likewise, face their responsibility of attending to teachers and administrators as equal partners in an enterprise which, up to now, has been assumed mostly by the university. Florida's

new state policy for teacher education will be fully realized when teachers, administrators, and college faculty learn to cooperate with one another on a more equal basis. In the end, the form of teacher education centers established in Florida may prove to be an experiment in a very old idea, democracy.

After the enabling legislation was passed, the implementation of teacher education centers at the local level followed a regular pattern. Initially, the State Department of Education sent information about the Teacher Education Center Act to all county school districts in Florida. Those districts interested in starting a center were asked to submit a letter of intent to the Commissioner of Education. From those letters several districts were invited to develop a full proposal for starting a center in their local district or in a multi-district arrangement. The proposals were reviewed by the State Council for Teacher Education Centers, a committee appointed by the Governor with representatives from the teaching profession, public and private colleges of education, local school districts, and the Department of Education. The Council was charged with developing guidelines and policy for the implementation of a state-wide system of teacher education centers. Part of their responsibility was recommending to the Commissioner the funding of specific centers: the State Council recommended ten centers for fiscal year 1974-75.

In their first year, centers, by design, were spread geographically across the state (see Fig. 1.).

NASSAU
DUVAL
BAKER
CLAY
PUTNAM
MARION
VOLUSIA
LAKE
ORANGE
PASCO
MANATEE
HARDEE
HIGHLANDS
PALM BEACH
BROWARD
DADE
Multi-Districts with Teacher Education Centers
Individual Districts with Teacher Education Centers

Of the first ten centers, seven serve one school district each, and three are multi-district centers serving three to eight counties each. Together the ten centers provide inservice training for twenty-four of Florida's sixty-seven counties. Although the law allows involvement in inservice and preservice teacher education, most centers are more involved with inservice training. In these counties, they serve 16,148 of the state's certified instructional personnel.* Table I gives pertinent information in more detail.

If you were to visit one of Florida's teacher education centers, you would probably find yourself in the administration office of a county school system. (There are three exceptions.) In most cases, you would first be shown an office or set of offices called the "teacher education center" where you would meet a secretary assigned to the center. Behind the secretary and her stack of messages and paper work, there would most likely be empty offices, with the director and the staff (if there is a staff) in the field. When in, they are busy channeling information, arranging training programs, and completing necessary paper work. You would not find a group of teachers, but those who manage the coordinating activity of inservice education.

Each center has a center council which plans and recommends policy for center operation.

*Number of teachers are reported early in the 1974-75 school year by individual centers.

TABLE I

Florida's Teacher Education Centers (1974-75)

Teacher Education Center District	Cooperating University	Cooperating Community College	No. of Certified Instructional Personnel
Alachua County	University of Florida	-------	1,258
Bay County	University of West Florida	Gulf Coast	1,052
Leon County	Florida A & M University Florida State University	Okaloosa-Walton -------	1,389
Okaloosa County	University of West Florida	Okaloosa-Walton	1,459
Osceola County	Florida Technological University	-------	438
Polk County	University of South Florida	Polk	3,360
Sarasota County	University of South Florida	Manatee	1,197
Mideastern (St. Lucie, Indian River and Martin Counties)	Florida Atlantic University	-------	1,591
PAEC* (Calhoun, Franklin Gulf, Holmes, Jackson, Walton, Liberty and Washington Counties)	University of West Florida Florida A & M University Florida State University	Chipola Gulf Coast Okaloosa-Walton	1,509
Southwest (Collier, Charlotte, DeSoto, Glades, Hendry and Lee Counties)	Florida Atlantic University Florida International University University of South Florida	Edison	2,895

*Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative
**As reported by individual centers, Fall, 1974

The center council is made up of representatives from the local school district, classroom teachers, community colleges, colleges of education, and community agencies, with the majority of members being classroom teachers as prescribed by law. Each center council is charged through teacher center legislation with four major responsibilities:

- Recommend policy and procedures for the teacher education center.
- Develop goals and objectives for the center within the policies as determined by the local school board.
- Recommend the employment of an appropriate teacher education center staff.
- Make recommendations on an appropriate budget.

Section III of this monograph describes in detail the activities of a center council.

The center director and staff administer center policy and programs recommended by the council and approved by the local school board through the superintendent. The director is appointed by the school board on the recommendation of the council. The director and staff serve as information sources for the council and work closely with the council as liaison with the local school

district and the cooperating teacher training institution(s).

The training work done through a teacher education center can be conducted by university personnel, classroom teachers, school district personnel, or community members with special expertise. Once a training need is determined by the center council through an assessment of teacher needs, training resources are sought and arrangements with training personnel are made. Teachers who have expressed interest in a training program are then contacted and the center activity is scheduled. Center training programs are scheduled during the normal workday of teachers and in early morning, afternoon, and weekend sessions. Sometimes the activity is short enough to be done during planning hours; at other times the activity is scheduled for a professional day or a day set aside especially for inservice work. The training activities can vary in length from an hour to a sustained program lasting the entire school year. When the training activity is scheduled on regular instructional days, center funds are used to provide substitutes for teachers attending training programs. When they are conducted at other times, teachers are paid stipends to attend.

During their first year of operation, there were financial incentives available to school districts for starting a teacher center. In addition to the categorized allocation for staff development in each school district, amounting to $5 for each full-

time student, those districts starting teacher education centers received a $20,000 grant from the State Department of Education and an appropriation of up to four full-time faculty positions from the State University System. On a state level this amounted to $200,000 in research and development funds and approximately $500,000 in college of education faculty services. The $20,000 for each center was designated as start-up funds to be used for the purchase of teacher training materials and the development of research pertinent to center operations. University faculty positions were appropriated to colleges of education in the State University System for the support of noncredit activities carried out in centers. Centers received from less than one to four faculty positions. With each position valued at $20,000 per calendar year, centers received from $15,000 to $80,000 worth of additional noncredit services each. In some counties, starting a teacher education center doubled the existing staff development budget; in others with larger allocations based on five dollars per student, starting a center was not a significant financial advantage.

Several aspects of teacher education centers resemble the staff development activities present in school districts without centers. Teacher education centers institute two fundamental changes. Under previous staff development arrangements, teachers served on an inservice committee which gave input into district level administrators and approved the inservice plan constructed by those administrators. With teacher centers, teachers

have the opportunity for more direct involvement in planning and decision-making. They can assume a more active role in shaping their own continuing education. Likewise, college faculty have a means through which they can take part in decisions which ultimately have a bearing on their activities. So, the teacher center brings with it an awareness of the involvement of others in teacher education and accepts collaboration as a means of governance. This shift causes some operational problems, discussed in Section II. The second fundamental change is associated with the shift toward cooperative decision-making. Funds for teacher education centers come from more than one source, which mandates a certain amount of cooperation among these agencies. Within the center council arrangement funds from all sources are pooled. The council as a whole recommends the expenditure of funds from each agency. This pooling of resources is designed to solidify the collaborative nature of center council operations.

Through the enabling legislation, teacher education centers are now taking their first steps. To date the legislation has paved the way for ten centers and has helped alter the traditional conception of inservice teacher education by facilitating new forms of cooperation among teacher training institutions, local school districts, and teacher organizations. Traditionally, inservice teacher education came from the university or the school district down to teachers in their classrooms. Now, by law, it is a partnership arrangement. This arrangement carries with it demands for new

styles of working together among institutions and individuals which in the past have operated independently of one another. Social scientists have long told us that new social arrangements cause new behaviors to emerge in those individuals participating in them. Thus teacher education centers in Florida have the potential of becoming a catalyst for change.

For centers to make a difference to teachers, the training programs they offer will have to be more responsive to the training needs of teachers than traditional inservice education offerings. Two issues are critical in providing responsive programs: the assessment of teacher training needs and the evaluation of center programs.

Centers were started in Florida without a well conceived way to assess teacher training needs. Each center made its own attempt to get information about training needs with a variety of approaches used. Centers in smaller school districts were able to assess needs informally. For example, the Osceola County center brought together members of the center council and teachers from each of the county's schools in order to work together in determining teacher training needs. The same approach would not be feasible in larger school districts.

One approach used by three centers that serve large numbers of teachers has included asking

See Appendix A for materials developed in these centers.

teachers to respond to a listing of teaching skills and subject area competencies in terms of their present level of mastery and need for further training. Teacher responses are then computed to find out which items (skills and competencies) ranked low in teacher mastery and ranked high in need for further training. The data are then used to determine priority training areas for the district and appropriate training for each school.

The evaluation of center programs is usually done by asking each teacher in a particular activity to evaluate the activity on forms provided by the center. The results are made known to the trainer and to the center council in most cases. But the teacher responses are not analyzed formally. A few centers have contracted with outside evaluators to help evaluate over-all center operations. In general, little systematic evaluation has been done.

In Florida the idea of centers preceded the full development of the technology that will enable centers to be more responsibe to teachers. Effective ways to assess training needs and evaluate programs are necessary components in the required technology. Clearly, considerable attention should be paid to their development. However, one should not assume that all problems associated with starting-up teacher centers are technological.

SECTION II

START-UP PROBLEMS OF TEACHER EDUCATION CENTERS IN FLORIDA

Although Florida's ten teacher education centers were implemented through the same legislative act, they have become as different from one another as they are alike due to dissimilar local situations. But they have faced common problems during their early efforts to implement change in school districts and universities. This section catalogs the common problems encountered in the first several months of center operation (Sept., 1974 to March, 1975). Some of the problems reported here have begun to dissipate; others have moved to the fore. This section is not concerned with the problems of one center or problems arising from local circumstances, unless to illustrate a general point. In stating a general view of start-up problems of teacher centers in Florida, some detail is lost. A careful look into one center can make up for that loss. Section III seeks to accomplish that task.

---

*This Section is based on a report entitled Start-Up Problems of Teacher Education Centers in Florida available through the Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida.

Teacher education centers in Florida are still taking their first steps. Consequently, research into these centers is necessarily in its beginning stages. Any report on center start-up problems, while timely, must be cursory. Presented here is the distillation of interviews with center directors, center staff, classroom teachers, university personnel, and center council members for most of the teacher education centers in Florida. Scheduling difficulty prevented visits to all centers. Even in those centers which were visited, busy schedules did not allow interviews with all individuals who should have been consulted. Consequently, this report has to be considered incomplete in some ways. The problem areas dealt with are abstracted below.

Deadlines and Directives. Collaborative planning necessary in teacher education centers required more time than expected. Deadlines were restrictive. Clear directives were needed from the state level.

Organizational Strain. School district and university norms were strained with shared decision-making. Personnel in these organizations had to contend with this strain as they implemented a new policy of teacher education.

Reward Systems. School district administrators are rewarded for not "rocking the boat." University faculty are rewarded basically for research and scholarship. Teachers are typically rewarded for passively receiving directives. Participation in teacher education centers encouraged behavior which falls outside of the traditional reward system for each group.

Needs Assessment. If center programs are to be responsive to the expressed needs of teachers, such needs have to be assessed. In many cases, programs were implemented without a comprehensive assessment of teacher needs.

Grass Roots Support. Teachers have to know about the center and how it can help them for the center to gain their support. New forms of communication may be needed to build and sustain support.

Incentives and Distractions. Financial incentives available to school districts for starting a center were inversely proportional to the size of the district. The earmarking of funds prevented some school districts from implementing a center.

External Events. A depressed economy has drained state revenues and caused cutbacks in funding to county districts. Growing teacher power has caused concern in several districts. Both factors influenced implementation of teacher education centers.

In general, those problems listed first were those mentioned most frequently in interviews with center personnel.

Deadlines and Directives

At the local level, planning time for developing center proposals was inadequate. Several centers reported there was insufficient time to work

collaboratively on center proposals. In some instances teacher groups did not know about the proposal until it was time to sign the proposal's cover letter. In one center, the proposal had to be hurriedly written over a weekend. And in those instances where proposal development did include significant cooperation among different interest groups, it was done by sacrificing personal time. Personnel in all centers agreed that more time for proposal development could have been helpful.

The time spent on the initial steps of getting the proposal written and sent to the Department of Education in Tallahassee varied from a few weeks to several months. In all cases, more time was needed. The collaborative planning necessary for center proposals took more time than most people estimated. Arranging schedules for meeting after meeting, getting to know unfamiliar faces, considering a new way of conducting inservice education, deciding on a plan, writing the proposal, and getting appropriate signatures through district and university systems were all time consuming processes.

The planning phase of center development has to be recognized as critical. Center personnel have reported starting their activities without complete management systems, without clear guidelines as to how decisions are to be made, without a clear notion of how resources are to be spent, and without ground rules for participation among various interest groups. Not that they started out willy-nilly, but they did report uncertain first steps.

Joint planning, a necessary part of the collaborative process, takes considerable time. To rush, or demand premature results, can jeopardize the potential of collaboration by hindering a fuller and more wholesome participation among all groups. The enabling legislation for teacher centers clearly intends to sponsor partnership arrangements in teacher education. Certainly, the intent of the legislation is short-circuited when deadlines are set that cause a center proposal to be written hastily.

Along with the lack of planning time, most center personnel, particularly center directors, reported that starting a center was made more difficult due to lack of guidelines or directives. Teacher education centers were a new experience for all. Many operational procedures were unclear. Those charged with the management of centers felt unsure of such basic issues as:

> What kinds of resources are available through the universities? How much can I use? How do I arrange for them? How are contact hours counted? Who pays the travel of university personnel?
>
> Is the teacher education center responsible for inservice work for all school district personnel? If so, should secretaries, bus drivers and lunchroom staff be included on the council?

How is the five-dollar FTE to be managed in multi-district teacher education centers? Does each county have to send all of the allotted five dollars to the center? What if a county in a multi-district center does not participate in all center activities - does it have to pay? Who is accountable for the expenditure of funds in a multi-county district?

How are center programs developed? Is there a sound needs assessment technique to determine training needs for teachers? How are staff development programs developed last year under the Master Inservice Plan implemented this year through the teacher center?

At the collegiate level, how are the non-credit lines managed? How is faculty paid? How can schedules be developed in advance?

Such uncertainties caused insecurity on the part of directors and university personnel and fostered a lack of clear direction on the part of center councils.

There is a certain wisdom in not binding up a new idea with too many directives at the state level. Yet, in the daily world of school district and university administration written directives can

provide security. In developing guidelines for new forms of organization a balance is desirable that gives direction and certainty to those local administrative units and provides the latitude and flexibility which are needed when organizational systems have to be grafted onto local arrangements.

Partnership problems. The problems of deadlines and direction were especially crucial during the early months of proposal writing and program planning. After those problems, most center personnel reported that collaboration and communication were the most difficult problems facing teacher centers in their early months. Both communication and collaboration are identified as problems in relation to their key role in maintaining partnership arrangements. The Teacher Education Center Act assigned the responsibility of designing, implementing, and evaluating center programs jointly to teachers, administrators, and university personnel. Learning to be equal partners has been a chief problem in all centers.

Collaboration is an appealing idea, but putting it into practice is another matter. It is time consuming and expensive. Finding a common and convenient meeting time in the busy lives of public school and university personnel is a basic problem in beginning and sustaining teacher center operation. Once found, that time has to be made free. In the case of classroom teachers this means providing substitutes, and when a meeting is set, money is needed to reimburse travel costs which may be considerable, especially in multi-district centers.

In effect, collaboration is expensive in terms of time and money. Moreover, in the minds of many who are in decision-making roles, the collaborative mode is not the most efficient one for reaching a decision, and people in those roles have learned to live with efficiency as a value.

Beyond concerns of time, money, and efficiency, there were more fundamental problems associated with collaboration: there were problems of partnership. The intended partnership arrangement is founded on the principle of shared decision-making among those parties affected by such decisions. The partnership principle is activated on the local level through a teacher center council consisting of teacher, school district, university and citizen representatives and is charged with establishing policy for the center. According to various center personnel, the sharing of decision-making in these councils has been hindered by local circumstances and traditional role expectations, some of which are temporary and are beginning to dissolve; others are more serious.

Problems of establishing partnership arrangements which have been reported are:

lack of background information necessary for decision-making, particularly among teacher groups;

Traditional social distance and role separation among different role groups in education are carried into shared

decision-making efforts and interfere with desirable group process.

People with power don't have to collaborate.

Council members don't have the interpersonal communication skills to be effective collaborators.

A few people tend to dominate information relating and decision-making at the expense of others' participation.

Decisions are made at another level and the council talks them over and acts as a rubber stamp.

It is possible for the superintendent, sometimes an assistant superintendent, to override a project which the council sponsors.

Teachers on this council were handpicked by the superintendent.

Such concerns are the tip of an iceberg. They suggest that psychological and sociological readiness is necessary to adopt collaboration as a means of governance. Psychologically, people need to be readied to participate in cooperative decision-making. For that process to take place, those with power have to learn to listen and attend to the input of others, and those without power have to

learn to express their concerns and opinions in a positive and mutually understandable way. It is necessary to overcome traditional role separation and social distance if collaboration is to take place. Sociologically, ingrained habits of who initiates action and who responds - which are expressions of the relative positions of individuals in a status order - have to undergo change. Collaboration requires the amendment of established patterns of unilateral decision-making present in school districts and universities. The semi-exclusive nature of decision-making in those administrative units has to be opened up.

Each center visited was making progress in the direction of the psychological and sociological prerequisites for collaboration. Subsequently, each center was undergoing some organizational strain in their change efforts (a center start-up problem in its own right to be discussed later).

Communication. Communication, or insufficient communication, was a problem usually mentioned along with collaboration. Communication is an internal problem in the workings of each center in the sense that communication networks have not been developed to get needed information to all center personnel and those affected by their decisions. School district personnel, teachers, deans, college professors, principals and teacher organizations all need to know what is going on in the center and be informed about matters pertinent to decisions to be made.

As decision-making moves toward a more participatory mode, communication structures come under pressure to change. When the structure of decision-making is unilateral, the initiator controls information and communication flow. It is to his advantage to control and guard information and communication, as it protects his place in the order. The process of going through "channels" is an expression of this communication structure. As participation in decision-making increases, more people need more kinds of information in order to assume a meaningful role in decision-making. More people need to know what is going on and the behind-the-scenes meaning of certain actions. To develop this kind of knowledge, new structures of communication will have to be formed.

Communication is also thought of as a problem in another way. Center directors and other center personnel want to know more about what is going on in other centers and at the state level. Insufficient communication among the centers and between centers and state agencies is another aspect of the larger communication problem. Stemming from a state-wide teacher education center conference held during November, 1974, at Orlando, the center directors agreed to meet on a regular basis to share information, concerns and ideas. No other role group has established regular meetings.

Organizational Strain

An inevitable problem of starting up Florida's teacher education centers was organizational strain.

The type of centers established through legislation could be put into operation only by grafting them onto already existing educational agencies. Consequently, if centers were to establish a new way of conducting inservice education, they had to do it through wrestling with established organizational patterns.

Center personnel work within on-going organizational settings in which operational procedures were established before the development of teacher education centers. Previously existing formal and informal arrangements associated with inservice work were disrupted by new styles of decision-making and new techniques for program planning, delivery and evaluation required in centers. For example, centers have established the following new methods for assessing teacher training needs: representative councils for decision-making; a new basis for cooperation between school districts, university personnel, and teachers. In addition, centers have been given control of inservice money.

In some instances, the strain took on a personal dimension as a shifting power base caused conflicts between role groups within school district administrative units. For example, directors had to adjust their relationships with other school district personnel. Several center directors were relatively new to district level administration, particularly at the director rank. If their newness alone was not enough to separate them from other district staff, their control of resources did. They frequently

were the only district level directors with their own budgets and they gained additional prestige by being involved in a new program receiving statewide recognition. These characteristics coupled with a different conception of inservice work and how it should be carried out placed strain on the relationships between center directors and other staff, especially those traditionally involved in inservice. Inservice work in most counties is a traditional concern of subject area curriculum coordinators. They have tended to make decisions about inservice offerings based on their perceptions of teacher needs and their offerings tended to focus on curriculum development in individual subject areas. Inservice took on another shape and meaning as the teacher center started up. Training needs were now seen more in terms of teaching skills and interpersonal skills, rather than strictly subject area skills. Decisions about the kinds of training to be offered were to be made cooperatively by the center council with representatives from various interest groups, rather than two or three people in a county office. Within this shifting power framework, directors faced strained relationships with school district staff employed as subject area coordinators who saw their power diminishing.

There was organizational strain on the college campus as well. Traditional ways of offering inservice education through workshops and consulting sessions were taking new shape through centers. Faculty were becoming involved in planning programs to meet expressed teacher training needs. Faculty

were assigned part-time to centers or school districts; sometimes as part of their regular load, sometimes as overload. Their work with teachers could become more sustained in this way. As a result of these different kinds of involvement, faculty behavior began to change. New systems of administering the additional resources gained through the teacher education center, and new procedures for accounting for faculty time also had to be developed. These new procedures were necessary to accommodate complicated formulas designed to determine how much faculty time should be spent in centers and to budget faculty lines granted for non-credit activity. Such new procedures and faculty behaviors set up tension in the existing college operations.

Teacher centers also placed new demands on teachers. Many teachers have become passive about inservice training. Historically, they have not initiated ideas about their own training. They usually took what was offered. As a consequence, they have not learned to conceive and communicate their training needs to others. Teacher education centers put them on unfamiliar ground by asking them to do so. In addition, teachers have grown used to their place in the line-oriented management of school bureaucracies. They are not accustomed to sitting down at a table with district administrators, principals, and college professors and acting as co-equals. As teachers take their place in the organization of teacher centers, their role is also strained.

Personal statements bear witness to organizational and role strain.

Directors said:

Where teacher education centers are put in the county organizational system is an important concern. If they are put in the wrong place, their purpose and activities can be shortstopped.

It (teacher education center) has given me an ulcer.

When our (teacher education center) activities aren't clearly separated from others in the county, conflict arises. And it's hard to keep them separated.

There is simply too much to do, too many meetings in which we don't reach any decision.

Sometimes I can't wait for the next meeting to make a decision. I have to act now.

We're all just learning to play the teacher center game.

If I weren't a good politician, we wouldn't have a teacher center here.

Teachers said:

Most of the time I don't know enough to put my two cents in.

I supported that activity because Mr. X (school district staff) said it was necessary.

You have to remember that we're "line" oriented here. Everything comes from top down.

Teachers were not consulted.

These meetings take me out of my classroom too much.

What difference does this make anyway?

Teacher center? Oh, I remember a fellow came and talked about it in a faculty meeting.

College of Education Personnel said:

The college is not structured to promote service to the field, and (the college) is where I have to live.

I like working with teachers, but it has to come out of my hide.

The system for designating faculty to serve teacher centers is informal now. In the future it will have to become more formalized.

We may be in a honeymoon period.
When more of the faculty finds out what
is going on, you can expect more trouble.

In visits to county school offices, colleges, and public school classrooms, it was apparent that teacher education centers were additions to established organizational arrangements which included habits of thought and action. Teacher centers are asking people within those systems to behave differently, and when the surrounding conditions which shape behavior do not change to support the adoption of new patterns of behavior, psychological and sociological disturbance follow.

Teacher centers, to the extent they demand or expect new behaviors, set up organizational strain. Such strain interferes with the smooth operation of the center and thus is part of their start-up problems. It is, however, a necessary one.

Reward Systems

Center start-up problems associated with reward systems are closely related to those of organizational strain. They have the same root: expecting or demanding new forms of behavior without support systems for that behavior.

Organizations structure the behavior of individuals to insure continuity and smooth operation. As a general principle, reward systems are established within organizations to accomplish

that end. For organizational participants, habits of thought and action become patterned and comfortable as they grow accustomed to the system in which they operate. These same principles hold true for school district administrators, college professors, and classroom teachers.

School district administrators report that they are rewarded basically for implementing and administering policy according to established guidelines and for not causing disturbances within the district system. As a teacher center is implemented, individuals charged with managing the center are in an insecure position on both counts. Center directors are forced to operate slightly out of the ordinary, slightly out of the reward system.

Similarly, university personnel work within a reward system which traditionally recognizes the worth of research and publication and is yet to recognize service to the field as an equally important consideration in promotion and tenure. Personnel in smaller universities do not report as sharp a dichotomy in the reward system as do their counterparts in the major state institutions. Reportedly, service to the field will in the future become a more important factor in the granting of tenure and promotion.

As they now stand, the reward systems in universities, school district administrative units and public schools do not reward participation in teacher education centers.

Needs Assessment

Center activities are supposedly designed specifically to fit the felt training needs of classroom teachers. The lack of a well developed system of assessing teacher training needs has constituted a problem in several centers. Most centers have assigned a high priority to the development of a needs assessment instrument. These instruments are being designed to identify teacher needs in the areas of teaching skills and interpersonal skills, as well as the more traditional curricular areas.

It is the feeling among most center personnel that an accurate assessment of needs is important in developing a responsive program of training activities. However, centers are just getting to work on systematic needs assessment and subsequent program development will take additional time.

An attendant problem is that teachers are not used to talking about their needs and are suspicious or indifferent about communicating them. Traditionally, telling your principal or county coordinator about your needs was the sign of a weak teacher. It never brought much help, but was a good way to get someone "snooping" around your room. Even with a needs assessment survey conducted by teacher center personnel, teachers express some concern that results not be shown to principals.

Building Grass Roots Support

Q: How many teachers in this building know about the teacher education center?

A: Not very many; others may have heard about it, but don't pay any attention to it.

Q: How did you get on the teacher center council?

A: I got a note from the county office telling me I was appointed and when the meeting was.

Q: What do the teachers you know think about teacher centers?

A: Many of them think it's a sham, another gimmick in a long line of new ideas. If they don't see it making a difference in their classroom, many of them are not interested. It will take time.

Building grass roots support for teacher centers is a three-part problem. First, many teachers are not familiar with what the teacher education center can do for them. This problem rests partially on the fact that centers have not, due to their short history, offered enough of the kinds of inservice work that would attract the necessary attention of teachers. Secondly, efforts to communicate with teachers about center activities have been incomplete. Thirdly, there is a problem of perceived ownership. As they exist, teacher centers are seen as the "property" of the district school system:

school district people run them and they are usually housed in school district offices. Centers do usually involve several teachers in center council activities as part of the decision-making body. Such teachers are typically picked either by the county office or the teacher organization, and in both cases appointed by the superintendent. In either case, there is no assurance that a majority of teachers in a school system know who these people are or communicate with them.

Efforts to develop a more systematic means of communication and support among classroom teachers have been undertaken by at least two centers which have adopted a system of "contact teachers" in each of the county's schools. The assumption of this arrangement is that a selected teacher in each school can get information into the center about training needs of that school and get information about the center into the schools. A drawback of this arrangement is that an additional burden is placed on those teachers serving as contact teachers without any reimbursement. Several contact teachers have expressed frustration in their role.

Incentives and Distractions

For those school districts starting a teacher education center, additional resources were available in the form of $20,000 per center for start-up expenses and up to four full-time equivalent university faculty positions per center. Most centers received less than four faculty positions. In a small county,

with an inservice budget around $40,000, these incentives may be of some financial importance. One county just about doubled its inservice budget by starting up a center. However, larger counties with centers report that additional resources gained were not a major factor in starting a center. In even larger counties, it is reported that the financial incentives were so negligible that they would not be worth the possible disruption a teacher center might make. Teacher centers are not found in the large urban counties in Florida.

One distraction has been the state ruling that all monies generated for inservice work (five dollars per FTE) be spent through the center. In larger counties this could put a considerable amount of capital in the teacher center (about one and one-half million dollars in Dade County, for instance). The county staff of larger counties can exercise more control of those resources without a teacher center. According to some accounts, larger counties might be more attracted to teacher centers if they did not have to spend all of their inservice funds through the center.

Another distraction is unanticipated events. With all good intentions and all good planning, unanticipated events still occur. In implementing change in organizational arrangements within a school district or university some problems can be projected and planned for; others will escape attention. For example, one county built teacher center activities into the existing Master Plan system. This meant that Master Plan project forms had to

be filled out for every center activity. Consequently, a flood of paperwork bogged down operations for a while.

External Events

Teacher center start-up problems have been complicated by external events beyond the control of those involved in centers. Dwindling state revenues due to the economic recession have caused a reduction of operating funds at the county level and in the state's public universities. Faculty lines designated to teacher centers have been lost. In one center funds have been temporarily frozen to be used in other school district operations. It would be hard to estimate the impact that economic hard times have had on the first year of center operation.

Another factor affecting the development of centers is the recent advent of collective bargaining and the growing power of teacher organizations. While the political clout of these organizations helped pass the enabling legislation for centers through the state legislature, it is reported that some counties in Florida do not want to get involved in teacher centers because they see centers as fanning the fires of teacher militancy. Others are concerned that centers will become bargaining items for school boards and teacher organizations.

The stated purpose of the Teacher Education Center Act, passed by the Florida Legislature, is to establish a new arrangement for the continuing

education of Florida teachers. Since organizational change is never easy and changing the behavior of individuals is no easy matter either, implementing the new arrangements necessary for teacher centers has been a complex task. It is tough business to change personal habits, alter organizational structures and contend with vested interests. Beyond the general problems attendant to any organizational change, teacher centers have had to forge a new conception of inservice teacher education at their local level, have had to implement structures which would facilitate that conception, and develop appropriate technologies. The problems discussed in this report are interrelated, rather than discrete. They revolve around efforts to conduct inservice teacher education in a more responsive way.

SECTION III

INSIDE CALICO TEACHER EDUCATION CENTER*

At the heart of each of Florida's teacher education centers is the center council which is charged with the major decision-making functions of the center. In an effort to illustrate the nitty-gritty of center council operations and give those interested in starting a center an idea of what can transpire during the first year of operation, we present a case study in diary format of the meetings of the Calico Teacher Education Center Council during its first year. We begin with preliminary meetings and move through those soul searching meetings in which council members question the purpose of the center, how it should be run, and the role of the center council in general. You will notice how concerns shift over time and how some of the more fundamental concerns persist, often unresolved. Although this case study is a diary of a hypothetical center council, it is based on the actual involvement in a center council by one of the authors.

Preliminary Meetings

The beginning of Calico Teacher Center can be traced back to early discussions between the

*a fictitious center

superintendent of Sycamore School System and the dean of a nearby college of education. Both were familiar with the new teacher center legislation and had already discussed the idea of teacher centering with others. In their discussion they agreed that the collaborative arrangements available through a teacher center might be a way to improve teacher education, particularly inservice education. The two institutions had a history of working together and the teacher center, in one way, made the relationship more formal.

In accordance with state law, a teacher center council was formed: the superintendent appointed six teachers from the school district, based on the recommendations of the local teachers' organization, and two county staff personnel; the dean appointed two members from the college of education. The Human Rights Council, a local community agency, was asked to select a citizen representative. With a council so formed, the superintendent appointed an acting chairperson to act as director of its efforts. The first preliminary meeting was held in early July, 1974, to begin thinking about the local teacher center and to make plans for sending a letter of intent to the State Department of Education.

Immediately, long and short range problems had to be faced. What might the center look like? What would be its purpose? Who could participate? How would it relate to existing programs and activities in teacher education? Who was to plan future meetings? Where were they to be held?

Who should write the letter of intent? How should the proposal be prepared?

Some council members talked of a center that might be a specific place, one which could be tied into an already existing learning resources center. Others felt the center should be a fluid operation of activities. Eventually it was decided that the center would function as a clearinghouse and coordinating agency for staff development. The group then discussed possible goals and objectives for these activities in preparation for writing the letter of intent.

In these preliminary meetings, prior to writing the proposal, the following kinds of activities and discussions took much of the council's time:

- review of needs assessment techniques previously used to develop inservice programs;

- money spent on inservice in previous years;

- possible relationships between existing groups and structures (for example, the inservice committee of the school district and the proposed teacher center council);

- lines of accountability and responsibility;

-examination of other teacher centers;

-university relationship to the teacher center;

-relationship and possible conflict between teacher needs and goals and school district needs and goals.

After initial discussions, the acting director wrote a letter of intent outlining the concept of the Calico Teacher Education Center and presented it to the school board for approval. Upon approval the letter was sent to the Department of Education in Tallahassee. With the planning underway the following groups were formed by council members for subsequent proposal writing:

-needs assessment procedures for the center;

-activities of the center;

-future projections of growth;

-organizational chart and budget for the center;

-goals, objectives, measurement procedures and data collection to be used by the center.

The ideas generated by each task group were reported to the full council and revised. The

acting director then synthesized the planning groups' ideas and wrote the final proposal required for state funding.

By late summer the Calico Center was approved by the Florida Department of Education and procedures for staff selection were determined. The council was charged by the teacher center legislation with the responsibility of selecting staff. However, the council asked the dean, the superintendent, and the executive board of the teachers' organization each to appoint one person to serve, along with the citizen representative, as an interview committee for staff selection, since several council members had expressed interest in the two full-time staff positions of director and resource teacher. The committee reviewed the applications and made their recommendations to the council which forwarded them to the superintendent for school board approval. As a result, the center director, a former school district administrator, and a resource teacher, a former classroom teacher, were appointed and the original planning group then became the official teacher education center council.

The newly formed council was immediately concerned with getting information about the center into the schools. To that end, a system of contact teachers was devised. Contact teachers were selected in a variety of ways (i.e., elected by teachers, appointed by principals, volunteered) for each school and asked to inform the teachers in their school about center activities. In addition,

the contact teacher was asked to inform the center about the training desires of the teachers in that school. To orient contact teachers to the center and its functions, a meeting for them was arranged during the preplanning days of the 1974-75 school year.

The September Meeting

As the first official council meeting took place in September, it became apparent that procedural questions related to council organization and functioning were fundamental and demanded attention. To facilitate the resolution of these problems, a committee was appointed to draft a working policy for the teacher center. Formulating and clarifying the center's priorities was to become a lasting concern, one which was often neglected in preference to meeting more pressing needs.

Questions about the center's budget formed a second important area of activity during this first meeting. Pertinent questions were raised: should budget guidelines be developed by the full council or should a budget committee be appointed? How should the council respond to resource requests by teachers? What roles, if any, should particular council members assume? Specific problems had already arisen as requests were being received for funds to attend fall conferences. Working without guidelines, the director asked the council for help in these matters. The council responded by suggesting emergency procedures to deal with these requests on an individual basis and called a special

meeting to do so. This meeting turned into a long, involved discussion that resulted not in the generation of guidelines or priorities, but rather in a review of the pros and cons of each request. The issue of determining priorities for staff development to guide future action was postponed. Although the council did decide on several specific requests, some members felt the council lost an opportunity to set long lasting guidelines for the future.

The October Meeting

At the October meeting, a draft of the working policy was presented by the previously established committee and reviewed by the council, which suggested some revisions and finally approved the draft. However, the question of working policy was far from settled. In establishing a working policy, several specific items were troublesome, such as reimbursement for attendance at professional conferences and meetings, the use of substitutes and consultants, individual research projects, individual school training programs, and the relationship of teacher center activity to the school district's plans for staff development. Again, a set of priorities for long term guidance continued to be set aside. The working policy was still in its first stage of evolution.

During the discussion related to approval of the working policy, three key issues came up. First, confusion existed as to the function of the teacher center council. Was it an advisory body or a policy-making group? The council deferred

to the legislative mandate which charged the council with the responsibility of recommending actions to the school board.

Second, the issue of council membership was raised. The director asked if there should be principal representation. Since principals are highly involved in the staff development process, were they not being left out of the teacher center decision process? There was some feeling that perhaps principal involvement would improve communications with the schools. After discussing various viewpoints, including the practical fact that teacher representation on the council would have to be increased if a principal were added, the council voted to add a principal representative. Subsequently, the issue of community representation was raised. The representative designated by the Human Relations Board had expressed a desire to withdraw from the council. The group agreed to honor this request and invite a citizen who had served on similar groups to be the community representative for the remainder of the year.

Third, procedures for screening financial requests were discussed. It was decided that a subcommittee would work with the staff to propose budget categories and expenditure limits. The council would then act on the budget proposed by the subcommittee. The council also delegated authority to teacher center staff to act upon requests in approved categories up to $500 without further council approval. The overall budget

would, of course, be subject to school board approval.

Again approaching the general problem of establishing a direction for the center, the council identified several tentative priorities for staff development through the center:

- -the involvement of teachers in decision-making regarding staff development;
- -a greater concern with preservice teacher training, especially through improving university/public school relationships;
- -the development and exchange of practical ideas for use in the classroom, along with an increased use of teacher talent in training programs;
- -sponsoring the development and dissemination of new ideas and innovations;
- -improving center functioning through the development of activities regarding communication with the schools and council operation;
- -the encouragement of a more thorough and continuing program evaluation.

In this meeting, overall communication was identified as an additional key issue for the council.

Feedback from the schools indicated that neither the existence of the council nor of the teacher center was well known. Teachers were either ignorant of teacher center services and possibilities, or already skeptical about the center as a new vehicle for inservice education. To help alleviate this problem, the council agreed to participate in the field testing of some new materials that focused on human relations processes and communications skills involved in teacher centering.

The November Meeting

At this meeting a number of special guests were present, including the superintendent, the assistant superintendent for instruction, and the dean of the college of education. Their comments expressed several different themes and concerns, all of which were relevant to the future role and function of the teacher center council:

- The council was spending an inappropriate amount of time reviewing specific proposals on a project-by-project basis, rather than setting directions, policies, and making recommendations regarding staff development. Had the council inadvertently gotten involved in directing the center staff to implement center activities before priorities had been set?

- Activities such as designing needs assessment procedures, recommending

staff development policy, identifying criteria for project evaluation, and monitoring the implementation of staff development programs were suggested as examples of appropriate council functions.

-Staff development is multi-leveled: individual, school, and program or county-wide. How do all of these levels fit into center activity? Specific concerns were expressed about the district level program supervisor's role in center activity.

-The council was urged to identify teacher needs from a variety of perspectives and to plan in the spring for teacher center budgeting.

-The visitors expressed concern about their lack of information about council activities.

These remarks, not all of which were brought out into the open, caused a considerable amount of reaction among council members. The record shows the following kinds of responses:

-The presence of people in power suggested their commitment to teacher center activity.

-The need to develop a means of personal communication with teachers to develop a better understanding of center activities was discussed.

-Methods for more effective communication to and from the schools and the college of education were suggested.

-The need to discuss various possibilities for data gathering procedures for an assessment of teacher training needs was mentioned.

-The council should focus on planning for next year so that carefully established priorities could provide direction for the center.

-Suggestions were made to renew the discussion on policy and procedures prior to an upcoming school board meeting, and to discuss the council's purpose in light of the day's discussion.

Some council members felt that a political maneuver had occurred in which the "bosses" were trying to keep the council from gaining too much power by taking away their direct involvement in approving or disapproving specific training projects.

The December Meeting

By December the debate over a working policy for the council was not yet over. The meeting was

spent reviewing the policy, with some changes being made. The council considered the idea of including a list of tentative priorities in the policy statement, but decided against doing so because the list was seen as needing further clarification and refinement. There was also some concern about the list not being based on an assessment of teacher needs. As a result of these reservations, the list was tabled indefinitely.

With attempts to resolve a direction for the center ending again in frustration, discussion regarding problems of communication resumed once more. The center staff had taken some measures to improve the image of the center through a slide-tape presentation, meetings with contact teachers and the distribution of a survey throughout the school system. Several of the council members had recently attended a state-wide meeting on teacher centers and had developed some ideas for improving communication. A task group was formed to study the communication problem and suggest appropriate strategies.

At the close of the calendar year, we find the teacher center council unsure of its purpose, and unclear about its role, but with some agreement as to its operational guidelines. It should be recognized that this lack of clarity was not unique to this center. A general questioning of purpose and scope was reported in Section II as a common start-up problem among all centers. The other major problems which found expression in the early meetings of this council, such as

communication, needs assessment, and proper relationships with existing agencies are also common among Florida's teacher centers in the first year.

The January Meeting

As the Calico Teacher Center began a new year, a number of new business items appeared on the agenda along with some old concerns. Ideas related to inservice training for principals were discussed as the new principal representative reported a survey he had conducted. In addition, plans for needs assessment were discussed, with the director requesting help in designing an appropriate procedure. The chairperson reported on his presentation of the center policy to the school board. The board approved the working policy, but expressed some concern about the lack of preservice activities and citizen involvement. They subsequently voted the following membership composition for the teacher center council: three citizens, ten teachers (three elementary, three middle school, and four high school), two county staff, one principal, and two college of education faculty. Because of the change in council composition, the entry of new members became a concern. Training by a university project interested in building the process of collaboration was suggested as one possibility; visiting other teacher centers and having a state-wide conference were suggested as others.

A new concern for the council was emerging as the remainder of the meeting was spent discussing

preservice teacher education and university/public school relationships particularly related to field work. The following points were made in the discussion:

- -supervision of interns by college of education faculty is inadequate;
- -interns are not well prepared;
- -the center could play a role in bringing interested groups together;
- -university reward system does not support service in the field;
- -defensive attitudes exist among respective role groups;
- -a university project on collaboration has made some studies in improving understanding - it could also serve as a vehicle for bringing people together to express concerns and share ideas.

A new dimension to the preservice problem was disclosed as a possible boycott by the local teachers association over a fee charge to teachers was brought out in the open. After much discussion, the council adopted a posture of collaboration rather than one of issuing ultimatums and drawing battle lines. When the discussion returned to training activities for preservice teacher education, a task

force was set up to deal with various problems of preservice education. The council did agree that some of its time and resources should be spent trying to reduce problems of preservice field work.

The February Meeting

The February meeting introduced a new concern: the support of the center by the school system.

The chairperson reported on a meeting he had had with the superintendent of schools. The superintendent's plans for next year (1975-76) included keeping the teacher center council as an advisory group, but doing away with the staff personnel (director and resource teacher) because of budget cuts. He further suggested allocating the categorical funds directly to school sites. Both recommendations dealt quite a blow to the center council. Council members questioned the implications of this possible decision and sent a letter requesting that the superintendent attend the next council meeting. In addition, the entire question of center funding was uncertain since the legislation which established centers was being re-examined, and the funding plan supported by the Commissioner of Education was uncertain.

The topic of preservice teacher education was again considered. By breaking into small groups with college of education faculty who attended as guests, several questions were raised. How could relationships be strengthened? What's happening

now? What would we like to see happen? Where have we experienced successes? What are the needs? What resources are needed to implement changes? As answers to these questions were generated, suggestions were made to list successes and evidences of cooperation which would emphasize positive accomplishments and;report them to school district personnel, legislators, and others.

The problems of needs assessment was becoming crucial for the council since planning was necessarily tied to what the assessment found. At this meeting the director presented a possible needs assessment model. However, the weight of other concerns prevented a careful consideration of the proposed model, and the problem of a thorough and systematic means for assessing teacher training needs persisted.

The March Meeting

This meeting began with the superintendent relating his views on the role of the Calico Council and staff in the center's operation. He was concerned about the amount of money being spent on staff rather than programs and suggested that the coordination of teacher center activities be assumed by another county staff person as a part of their responsibility. In his view, the council would continue functioning as a recommending body for staff development priorities. Questioning the superintendent, council members indicated the need for a full-time teacher center staff. In response, the superintendent agreed to review a list of vital staff

functions developed by the council before he made his final decision.

During this meeting considerable time was also used in discussions of summer plans for the center.

The April Meeting

The April meeting provided some relief for the council. A letter from the Commissioner of Education was received commending the Calico Center for its efforts. Secondly, the superintendent announced that he had considered the report of the council on center staff functions and agreed that one full-time person was necessary.

The staff reported on meeting with elementary school people about planning for next year. Forms for requesting funds had been distributed. Needs assessment interviews had been conducted in two schools on a try-out basis. The teacher appraisal process was discussed, and plans for meeting with middle school and secondary school contact teachers were announced. Mailings were sent to both principal and contact teachers with the hope that school needs would be discussed at the local site prior to the meeting.

In an effort to accomplish some year-end closure and future planning, the director established the following sub-committees:

-Selection of permanent staff person and contact teachers in local school sites;

-Priorities and budget;

-Policy revision and task group organization;

-Role of council regarding center staff and contact people.

The May Meeting

As the first year of teacher center operation came to an end, meetings became somewhat confused. At least two factors contributed to this confusion: the anxiety commonly experienced by school personnel as demands press on them at the end of the school year, and an uncertainty about the pending change in the directorship of the center. The last meetings of the council were influenced by these factors and discussion within these meetings often wandered among several topics.

The May meeting began with the council divided into the subcommittees established at the previous meeting. Each group's work focused on planning for the next year, and each subcommittee later reported its suggestions to the full council.

The subcommittee on the role of contact teachers reported the following recommendations:

-Contact teachers should be selected during preplanning;

-Bimonthly meetings of contact teachers should be scheduled and those attending should be paid a stipend;

-A school site system of peer evaluation should be devised for contact teachers;

-Contact teachers should report on teacher center activities at each school site;

-More face-to-face communication with contact teachers should take place through meetings, social gatherings, and informal conversations.

These recommendations were approved and implementation was urged for next year.

The subcommittee on policy formation reported no recommended changes in the center's policy approved earlier by the school board, but did suggest the need for task groups to help the incoming director, especially for funding review.

The subcommittee on budget and priorities for the center called attention to the need for a framework of priorities which could give meaningful direction in budget matters. The group recommended a formula for the allocation of funds by individual, school site, and school district categories. The discussion generated by their report ranged over several topics including a definition of staff development, the issue of using substitutes vs. stipends to release time for teachers, and plans for summer programs.

With the directorship open for next year, the staff appointment subcommittee report received careful attention. Since several people on the council were applying for the position, a decision was made not to have the council sit as the interviewing body. The appointment of the director subsequently went through established hiring procedures of the school district with some input from two council members.

The May meeting continued with an evening session which saw further discussion of the following:

-teachers receiving stipends for attending workshops;

-the questionable usefulness of problem solving workshops for teachers;

-the lack of receptivity of teachers to the survey of needs assessment;

-the effectiveness of county-wide reading inservice activities;

-preference toward the use of teachers as workshop leaders.

The June Meeting

At the end of the year, the directorship changed hands. The council agreed that some informal meetings should take place over the

summer, especially task groups, which would aid in the transition of directors.

In terms of budget guidelines for the following year, the council tentatively agreed to distribute money according to the following categories:

-50%: School-based projects with approved programs by the council;

-40%: District-wide projects sponsored by the teacher center;

-10%: Individual projects not associated with the above categories.

The option plan for school-based staff development received support from the council. However, the council felt it important that schools have a careful plan for inservice work before they received funds from the center. Future meetings would deal with limits for expenses; who would receive and approve school plans for staff development; and when and by whom schools would be informed about the new plan for school-based staff development.

The council also agreed to enlist the help of two outside groups during the next year in order to help in two crucial areas: the improvement of council planning and evaluation procedures, and specific training for the center council and staff in communication skills and problem solving skills. At the end of the first year, both of these areas were viewed as important for the council's effectiveness and continued growth.

The Calico Teacher Education Center council proved to be typical in some major respects: in its struggle to determine a clear sense of direction; in its problems with communication both with classroom teachers and with the school district and college of education; and in its recognition that collaboration requires certain human relations skills not necessarily present among council members. Some of its experiences were unique, but in general, we found that this center faced several problems in common with teacher education centers throughout the state -- problems that are associated with sharing power and developing new sets of individual and institutional behavior consistent with power-sharing.

SECTION IV

GENERALIZATIONS FROM THE FLORIDA EXPERIENCE

In our effort so far we have tried to give the day-to-day details of the problems which have faced teacher education centers in their efforts to introduce a change in teacher education. We have necessarily kept general arguments to a minimum, but there are several points which can be drawn together in a section on generalizations from the Florida experience.

It seems clear, if one is to believe some of our current writers such as C. P. Snow, Alvin Toffler, and Russell L. Ackoff, that rapid change is with us in modern society. It appears equally clear that an important change taking place is a movement toward participatory democracy. Interest groups in several of our major institutions, including public education, are now insisting on their right to participate in decisions that affect them.

The way in which teacher education centers have been structured in Florida could very well exemplify a kind of participatory system. They were designed explicitly to encourage a greater degree of participation on the part of all those involved in teacher education. With the exception of a few technical problems, most of the problems discussed in this monograph have been expressions

of the changes necessary to implement a more participatory system in the education of teachers.

In essence, teacher education center activity assumes a belief in institutional cooperation and shared decision-making among interest groups involved in teacher education. However, the belief is different from the practice, as the ideal is different from the real. A clear understanding on the part of those involved as to where the power rests on any given issue is required if shared decision-making is to really work. Also, the interests of each group have to be known. In terms of popular jargon, each member has to know "what's in it for me." Gaining this understanding will certainly take time. Participants also have to be able to identify the potential benefits for participation in a teacher education center so they can balance that gain with the loss of time and effort. If there are no gains for an interest group, then power-sharing is an unnecessary exercise.

The power-sharing issue is related to communication difficulties within teacher education centers in two ways. With increased participation in decision-making, communication structures have to be reshaped to include many more people. Lack of important information and the meaning of such information can only hinder the collaborative process which is designed to be the heart of each teacher center in Florida. Once structures have altered, attention also has to be directed toward the quality of the communication.

Because of differences in role and background, all council participants may not be speaking the same sort of language. An acquaintance with local jargon and specialized phrases of educational personnel is required and some training in communication skills is generally recommended.

Since teacher education centers in Florida are not specific places, they suffer from an identity problem. Many centers have gone to considerable expense in making slide-tape presentations or movies about their center to be used in making the center well known to school personnel. Centers have hoped that such efforts would help them gain needed support. In this way the problems of grass-roots support are often linked to communication with classroom teachers. Yet, the problems of support may very well go beyond communication with the field. In the past, inservice education has not been popular among many teachers. Teacher education centers will gain support from teachers on the basis of the services they provide to them. Centers will be judged by the fruit they bear.

Experience suggests that modest and reasonable goals seem to have a better chance of achievement than do lofty ones. Centers may serve themselves well by focusing on projects that meet immediate teacher training needs and that can be accomplished in one year. Several successful projects can help get the center off to a good start.

Teacher education centers, as a process of institutional cooperation and shared decision-making, come into conflict with the existing procedures for conducting inservice education. For example, the personnel and procedures associated with school district plans for inservice training and staff development (required of every school district by the Department of Education) and those associated with college campus and off-campus offerings are already operating when teacher education centers come onto the scene. Making provisions for initial co-existence, communication and coordination is mandatory. To the extent that centers demand new behaviors in the conduct of inservice teacher education, strain between the old and new ways of behaving will occur.

As centers face their future, they will have to face the question of their proper institutional alignment. Under current legislation they are placed within school district administrative units, which may eventually lead to the use of the center by the school district or the Department of Education for their own purposes. Without question, school districts have a large stake in center operations, particularly since they are the largest contributors to their operation. Yet, under present arrangements, centers are ultimately a part of their host school district and controlled by school district regulations. If a question arises, the school board has the final word. This may eventually act to erode the confidence of college and teacher participants in the center. If the teacher education center is to be open for participants, it may have

to become a more independent agency.

One of the most exciting aspects of teacher education center development, in our view, is its potential for establishing new priorities, new structures, and new patterns in teacher education, both preservice and inservice. Already some practices are being questioned as center operation is forcing an exploration of several issues that may lead to improved education for Florida's teachers. Indeed in their first year, the success of teacher education centers can be better measured by the issues they have forced to attention than by actual changes that they have been able to manifest. We feel a listing of these issues is a good way to conclude our examination of teacher education centers in Florida. These issues portray the future landscape over which teacher education centers will travel in their future.

Who "runs" the teacher education center? Does any one group have more at stake than another? What makes the center legitimate to the participating agencies? Who is ultimately accountable to whom? How should teacher education center resources be generated and allocated? What role should the state play? How does the center fit into the total educational scene?

How are teacher training needs most appropriately identified? What are the advantages of various needs assessment strategies? Does the mandating of inservice training needs by "higher-ups" have a legitimate place in centers?

Once inservice needs have been identified, what should "delivery systems" look like? What are the appropriate incentives for participation in inservice programs? Are current inservice strategies appropriate? Should inservice teacher education have long range programs goals or should it be determined solely by immediate training needs as expressed by teachers? How are the training needs of individual teachers, specialized teacher groups, school sites, and the school district to be balanced?

Are current institutional norms appropriate for teacher education centers? Reward systems for college faculty, school district administrators, and teachers do not seem to facilitate participation within teacher education centers. What are the implications for the college of education as faculty assume a changing role in inservice education? How is their increased participation to be funded? Will university personnel have to be retrained? What about public school personnel: will continuing education become part of the job description of teachers? Does increased teacher involvement and leadership in inservice education have any implications for the role definition of teachers? What happens to the roles of curriculum and subject matter supervisors at the school district level as their role in determining teacher training programs diminishes?

These questions pinpoint some critical future issues for those interested in teacher education centers.

The answers to these questions will have to be worked out by those involved in various aspects of public education. If teacher education centers enable the various interest groups in teacher education to work through such issues in ways that provide valuable learning experiences for teachers and viable forms of institutional co-operation, then teacher education centers can be considered a success. We hope they will be.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The purpose of this bibliography is to provide useful starting points in the literature on teacher centers. If you have access to ERIC microfiche, you will find a great deal of information about centering there.

JOURNAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION, Vol. 25, No. 1., Spring, 1971. *This issue includes ten articles on various aspects of centering.*

Allen Schmieder and Sam Yarger. TEACHING CENTERS: TOWARD THE STATE OF THE SCENE (Washington, D. C.; The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974). *It also includes a lengthy bibliography.*

Bruce Joyce and Marsha Weil. CONCEPTS OF TEACHER CENTERS. (Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1973); Ed. 075 375.

Benjamin Rosner. "The British Teacher Center: A Report on Its Development, Current Operations, Effects, and Applicability to Teacher Education in the U. S."; ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. Ed 090 165.

Sam Yarger and Albert Leonard. A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE TEACHER CENTER MOVEMENT IN AMERICAN EDUCATION; (Syracuse, N. Y.: School of Education, 1975).

Kathleen Devaney and Lorraine Thorn. EXPLORING TEACHERS' CENTERS; (San Francisco, CA, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1975).

APPENDIX A

On the following pages we have included examples of an instrument designed to survey the inservice needs of teachers in the Southwest Florida Teacher Education Center, Lee County, Florida. All teachers are asked to respond to the first forty (40) statements. Programs begin with number forty-one (41) and have varying numbers of questions. This basic format is used to collect data in the following areas: Elementary: Physical Education; Secondary: Social Studies, Science, Music, Art, Physical Education; Foreign Languages, Industrial Arts, Exceptional Student Education, Pupil Personnel, Media Cooperative Education (DE, DCT, WE, JE), Business Education, and Home Economics.

This procedure, or an adaptation of it, is also used in the Polk and Sarasota County Teacher Education Centers.

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT: ALL TEACHERS GENERIC

(a) Level of Knowledge (b) Training Needs		LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE (ODD NUMBERS)				TRAINING NEEDS (EVEN NUMBERS)		
		Expertise in: (experienced, practiced and can serve as a resource person)	Worked with in many situations--even though modified	Knowledge of: (extends beyond definition but have not worked with)	No knowledge of (extends to no more than simple definition)	Immediate need for further training	Desire further training	Do not desire training
Selecting and writing goals/ objectives	1. (a) → 2. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Selecting, adapting and developing materials and activities	3. (a) → 4. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Identifying needs and planning for individual differences among students	5. (a) → 6. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Individualizing instruction/ maintaining records of performance	7. (a) → 8. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Motivating/reinforcing students	9. (a) → 10. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Conducting classroom discussion/using questioning techniques	11. (a) → 12. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Using standardized tests and interpreting test data	13. (a) → 14. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Developing and using teacher-made tests	15. (a) → 16. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT ALL TEACHERS GENERIC

(a) Level of Knowledge (b) Training Needs	LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE (ODD NUMBERS)				TRAINING NEEDS (EVEN NUMBERS)		
	Expertise in (experienced, practiced and can serve as a resource person)	Worked with in many situations--even though modified	Knowledge of (extends beyond definition but have not worked with)	No knowledge of (extends to no more than simple definition)	Immediate need for further training	Desire further training	Do not desire training
Diagnosing and evaluating social-emotional characteristics	17. (a) → 1	2	3	4	1	2	3
	18. (b) →						
Identifying behavior problems and possible solutions to those problems	19. (a) → 1	2	3	4	1	2	3
	20. (b) →						
Developing student self-concepts, attitudes, and values	21. (a) → 1	2	3	4	1	2	3
	22. (b) →						
Organizing physical setting of classroom (furniture, bulletin boards, etc.)	23. (a) → 1	2	3	4	1	2	3
	24. (b) →						
Techniques of planning and utilizing educational media	25. (a) → 1	2	3	4	1	2	3
	26. (b) →						
Communicating and interacting with other faculty members and students	27. (a) → 1	2	3	4	1	2	3
	28. (b) →						
Communicating and interacting with parents and community	29. (a) → 1	2	3	4	1	2	3
	30. (b) →						
Utilizing the school campus as an instructional resource	31. (a) → 1	2	3	4	1	2	3
	32. (b) →						
Utilizing the community as an integral part of instruction	33. (a) → 1	2	3	4	1	2	3
	34. (b) →						

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT: ALL TEACHERS GENERIC

(a) Level of Knowledge (b) Training Needs	LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE (ODD NUMBERS) Expertise in: (experienced, practiced and can serve as a resource person)	Worked with in many situations--even though modified	Knowledge of: (extends beyond definition but have not worked with)	No knowledge of (extends to no more than simple definition)	TRAINING NEEDS (EVEN NUMBERS) Immediate need for further training	Desire further training	Do not desire training

For each item, on a scale of 1 to 4, mark how you would like to receive training. 1 being very desirable; 4 being least desirable.

TYPE OF INSERVICE		CHOICE			
Before/after school workshops at your school	35.	1	2	3	4
Saturday workshops	36.	1	2	3	4
Inservice Day workshops	37.	1	2	3	4
Evening workshops	38.	1	2	3	4
On-site workshops (during school day)	39.	1	2	3	4
Summer Workshops	40.	1	2	3	4

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT: ELEMENTARY

(a) Level of Knowledge (b) Training Needs	LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE (ODD NUMBERS)				TRAINING NEEDS (EVEN NUMBERS)		
	Expertise in (experienced, practiced and can serve as a resource person)	Worked with in many situations--even though modified	Knowledge of (extends beyond definition but have not worked with)	No knowledge of (extends to no more than simple definition)	Immediate need for further training	Desire further training	Do not desire training
Reading: developing reading interests	41. (a) → 1	2	3	4			
	42. (b) →				1	2	3
Reading: pre-requisite readiness skills	43. (a) → 1	2	3	4			
	44. (b) →				1	2	3
Reading: word recognition skill (structural/phonetic analysis, content, etc.)	45. (a) → 1	2	3	4			
	46. (b) →				1	2	3
Reading: identifying and instruction in relation to individual student needs	47. (a) → 1	2	3	4			
	48. (b) →				1	2	3
Reading: comprehension skills	49. (a) → 1	2	3	4			
	50. (b) →				1	2	3
Reading: reference and study skills	51. (a) → 1	2	3	4			
	52. (b) →				1	2	3
Reading: adapting reading materials in the content areas	53. (a) → 1	2	3	4			
	54. (b) →				1	2	3
Math: Materials, methods and techniques for teaching whole numbers (concepts and computational skills)	55. (a) → 1	2	3	4			
	56. (b) →				1	2	3
Math: Materials, methods and techniques for teaching fractional numbers	57. (a) → 1	2	3	4			
	58. (b) →				1	2	3

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT: ELEMENTARY

(a) Level of Knowledge (b) Training Needs		LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE (ODD NUMBERS)				TRAINING NEEDS (EVEN NUMBERS)		
		Expertise in: (experienced, practiced and can serve as a resource person)	Worked with in many situations--even though modified	Knowledge of: (extends beyond definition but have not worked with)	No knowledge of (extends to no more than simple definition)	Immediate need for further training	Desire further training	Do not desire training
Math: Materials, methods and techniques for teaching problem solving	59. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	60. (b) →					1	2	3
Math: Materials, methods and techniques for teaching geometry	61. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	62. (b) →					1	2	3
Math: Materials, methods and techniques for teaching standard and metric measurement	63. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	64. (b) →					1	2	3
Language Arts: Writing skills (penmanship, composition, creative writing)	65. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	66. (b) →					1	2	3
Language Arts: Listening Skills	67. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	68. (b) →					1	2	3
Language Arts: Oral Language skills/dialects and standard English	69. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	70. (b) →					1	2	3
Language Arts: children's literature	71. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	72. (b) →					1	2	3
Science: Managing the science classroom	73. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	74. (b) →					1	2	3

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT: ELEMENTARY

(a) Level of Knowledge (b) Training Needs		LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE (ODD NUMBERS)				TRAINING NEEDS (EVEN NUMBERS)		
		Expertise in: (experienced, practiced and can serve as a resource person)	Worked with in many situations--even though modified	Knowledge of: (extends beyond definition but have not worked with)	No knowledge of (extends to no more than simple definition)	Immediate need for further training	Desire further training	Do not desire training
Science process skills (observing, classifying, inferring, measuring, space/time relations, communicating)	75. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	76. (b) →					1	2	3
Science: helping students with experiments and investigations	77. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	78. (b) →					1	2	3
Science: Environmental Education	79. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	80. (b) →					1	2	3
Health: Growth and development	81. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	82. (b) →					1	2	3
Health: Drugs and Drug Abuse	83. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	84. (b) →					1	2	3
Social Studies content (man and society, geography, culture, government, economics)	85. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	86. (b) →					1	2	3
Social Studies: values clarification skills	87. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	88. (b) →					1	2	3
Social Studies: critical thinking skills	89. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	90. (b) →					1	2	3
Social Studies: Chart, map and graph skills	91. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	92. (b) →					1	2	3

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT ELEMENTARY

(a) Level of Knowledge (b) Training Needs		LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE (ODD NUMBERS)				TRAINING NEEDS (EVEN NUMBERS)		
		Expertise in (experienced, practiced and can serve as a resource person)	Worked with in many situations--even though modified	Knowledge of (extends beyond definition but have not worked with)	No knowledge of (extends to no more than simple definition)	Immediate need for further training	Desire further training	Do not desire training
Social Studies Research Skills	93. (a) 94. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Career Education concepts and strategies	95. (a) 96. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Music skills (rhythm, melody, harmony)	97. (a) 98. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Music education and instrument skills	99. (a) 100. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Art criticism of art objects skills	101. (a) 102. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Organizing materials for planning, implementation, and evaluation of instructional programs	103. (a) 104. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Art production of art objects skills	105. (a) 106. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Interpreting process and product standards and communicating accreditation data	107. (a) 108. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Instructional Approaches: teaching the special education student	109. (a) 110. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT: ELEMENTARY

(a) Level of Knowledge (b) Training Needs		LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE (ODD NUMBERS)				TRAINING NEEDS (EVEN NUMBERS)		
		Expertise in (experienced, practiced and can serve as a resource person)	Worked with in many situations--even though modified	Knowledge of (extends beyond definition but have not worked with)	No knowledge of (extends to no more than simple definition)	Immediate need for further training	Desire further training	Do not desire training
Instructional Approaches teaching the reluctant learner (student that functions between special ed. and average)	111. (a) →	1	3	5	4			
	112. (b) →					1	2	3
Instructional Approaches teaching the learning disability student	113. (a) →	1	2	5	4			
	114. (b) →					1	2	3
Instructional Approaches teaching the gifted student	115. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	116. (b) →					1	2	3
Instructional Approaches: Team planning and teaching	117. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	118. (b) →					1	2	3
Instructional Approaches Organizing the curriculum and classroom to meet individual differences	119. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	120. (b) →					1	2	3
Instructional Materials Using arts and crafts in the content areas	121. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	122. (b) →					1	2	3
Instructional Materials Selecting, developing, using, and evaluating non-textbook instructional materials (printed and audio-visual)	123. (a) →	1	2	3	4			
	124. (b) →					1	2	3

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT: MIDDLE SCHOOL

(a) Level of Knowledge (b) Training Needs		LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE (ODD NUMBERS)				TRAINING NEEDS (EVEN NUMBERS)		
		Expertise in (experienced, practiced and can serve as a resource person)	Worked with in many situations--even though modified	Knowledge of (extends beyond definition but have not worked with)	No knowledge of (extends to no more than simple definition)	Immediate need for further training	Desire further training	Do not desire training
Understanding middle school philosophy, objectives and goals	109. (a) → 110. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Planning for personal development of students	111. (a) → 112. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Counseling and providing indirect guidance for students	113. (a) → 114. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Promoting positive relationships with teachers, parents, and community	115. (a) → 116. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Communicating and interacting with students	117. (a) → 118. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Teaching students techniques of problem solving	119. (a) → 120. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Planning and conducting interdisciplinary lessons	121. (a) → 122. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Developing and conducting exploratory studies	123. (a) → 124. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Organizing teaching according to transescent developmental process	125. (a) → 126. (b)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS ASSESSMENT: MIDDLE SCHOOL

(a) Level of Knowledge (b) Training Needs		LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE (ODD NUMBERS)				TRAINING NEEDS (EVEN NUMBERS)		
		Expertise in: (experienced, practiced and can serve as a resource person)	Worked with in many situations--even though modified	Knowledge of (extends beyond definition but have not worked with)	No knowledge of (extends to no more than simple definition)	Immediate need for further training	Desire further training	Do not desire training
Using effectively a variety of teaching-learning theories	127. (a) → 128. (b) →	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Planning for self-directed learning	129. (a) → 130. (b) →	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Providing for flexibility in scheduling	131. (a) → 132. (b) →	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Participating in cooperative planning and team teaching	133. (a) → 134. (b) →	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Providing for reading in the content area and/or developmental reading	135. (a) → 136. (b) →	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Grouping and regrouping of students to facilitate instructional plan	137. (a) → 138. (b) →	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Designing classroom management techniques for multi-age groupings	139. (a) → 140. (b) →	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
	. (a)							
	. (b)							
	. (a)							
	. (b)							

FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, INC.

Officers:

President, Dr. Robert Shaffer
Treasurer, George Marshall

Board of Directors:

Buren Dunavant; Laura Geddie; Frank Green; Samuel Hunter; Daniel Hutchison; William Odom; C. A. Vaughn

Executive Secretary:

William F. Breivogel, University of Florida

Assoc. Exec. Sect., North Florida Component:

Jeff Pyatte, University of West Florida

Assoc. Exec. Sect., South Florida Component:

Charlie Council, Florida Atlantic University

Alachua County	John Dukes
Baker County	Mrs. Yvonne Stephens
Citrus County	Charles P. Hayes
Collier County	Dr. Gene Barlow
Columbia County	Dr. Frank Phillips, Supt.
Dixie County	Lloyd Jones
Flagler County	Walter S. Morris, Jr.
Gilchrist County	Leroy Bowdoin
Gulf County	Mrs. Laura Geddie
Hamilton County	John Hart
Hernando County	Mrs. Ruth Marsh
Highlands County	James Ferrell Smith, Supt.
Indian River County	Samuel A. Hunter
Lafayette County	Albert J. Winburn, Supt.
Lake County	Dr. C. A. Vaughn, Jr.
Lee County	Hugh C. Flanders
Levy County	Mrs. Pearle Gibbons
Madison County	Dr. Oscar A. Beck
Manatee County	George Marshall
Marion County	Al Appleby
Martin County	Dr. Robert Shaffer
Nassau County	William L. Webb
Okeechobee County	John Kinsaul
Pasco County	Mary Giella
Polk County	Daniel Hutchison
Putnam County	William Odom
St. Johns County	Mrs. Gertrude Taylor
St. Lucie County	James Thomas
Santa Rosa County	Frank Green
Sumter County	Wayne Ham
Suwannee County	Everett L. Williamson
Taylor County	Robbins R. Woodell
Union County	Buren L. Dunavant
Washington County	Kelly Brock, Supt.

Associate Membership:

Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative, W. L. Kitching, Dir.

RESEARCH BULLETINS

The Self and Academic Achievement
-W. W. Purkey
Slow Learner Problem in the Classroom
-M. Cunningham
Theory Into Practice Through Systematic Observation
-R. Ober
The Search for Self: Evaluating Student Self Concepts
-W. W. Purkey
The Nongraded School
-Breivogel and Rogers
Sensitivity Training in Perspective
-B. Ellis
Writing Behavioral Objectives
-H. McAshan
School Advisory Committee
-Breivogel and Greenwood
Enhancement of the Self-Concept: A Case Study
-Edgar, Guertin, et al.
Educational Provision for Emotionally Disabled Children
-Bullock and Brown
The Administrator Looks at Programs for Emotionally Disturbed Children: Guidelines for Planning
-Bullock and Justen
The Learning Centers Approach to Instruction
-George, Kinzer, et al
Case Law and Education of the Handicapped
-Collings and Singletary
Individualization of Instruction - High School Chemistry: A Case Study
-Altieri and Becht
Competencies Needed for Teaching Emotionally Disturbed and Socially Maladjusted Children and Youth: Implications for Staff Development
-Bullock, Kelly, and Dykes
Value Clarification in the Social Studies: Six Formats of the Value Sheet
-Casteel and Stahl
The Florida Professional Practices Council
-Newell and Ingram
Performance Based Teacher Supervision Using Modeling
-Koran and Koran
Ten Years of Open Space Schools: A Review of the Research
-George
Annual Report of School Progress: An Analysis and Indication of Alternatives
-Breivogel and Greenwood

Bulletins listed above:	
Single copies:	$1.00
Five or More Copies:	10% Discount
Libraries and Students:	25% Discount

Orders of four or less must be prepaid
All billed orders will carry postage and handling charges.